

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

DANIELLE LLERA,

Plaintiff,

v.

TECH MAHINDRA (AMERICAS) INC.,

Defendant.

NO. C19-0445RSL

ORDER GRANTING  
DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR  
PROTECTIVE ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on “Tech Mahindra (Americas) Inc.’s Motion for Protective Order.” Dkt. # 34. Having reviewed the memoranda, declarations, and exhibits submitted by the parties,<sup>1</sup> the Court finds that a protective order is appropriate. The four categories of documents specified in the proposed protective order (Dkt. # 34-2 at 2) are the type of confidential, non-public business information that is regularly afforded protection in this district. *See, e.g., Hill v. Xerox Corp.*, No. C12-0717JCC (W.D. Wash. Mar. 27, 2014) (Dkt. # 112) (finding that documents containing significant detail about employee compensation plans are sources of business information that could be used to harm defendant’s competitive standing, justifying a protective order). The fact that plaintiff’s claims rely on a comparison between her compensation and that of other employees does not make the sales commission plans pursuant to

---

<sup>1</sup> This matter can be decided on the papers submitted. Defendant’s request for oral argument is DENIED.

1 which the compensations were calculated or the payroll information of her co-workers public or  
2 reduce the likelihood that its disclosure could harm defendant's competitive standing. If plaintiff  
3 believes that defendant has designated documents improperly, the protective order provides a  
4 process through which she can challenge the designations.  
5

6  
7 The Court will enter the protective order proposed by defendant: designations made prior  
8 to entry of the Order are retroactively covered by the order.  
9

10 Dated this 16th day of July, 2020.

11 

12 Robert S. Lasnik  
13 United States District Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27